



Case Summary

General Case Information

Case Number	Case Type	Sub Case Type	Release to Database
1051088	Interpretation Request	Recruiting - Bylaw 13	No

Division	Sport(s)
I	

Legislative Cite(s)

16.11.1.1 - General Rule.
13.7.3.1(13.7.2.1 current) - General Restrictions.
- Benefits Resulting from an Established Relationship (I)
12.1.2.1.6 - Preferential Treatment, Benefits or Services.

Status Information

Status	Status Date	Status Level	Status Level Type
Resolved	03/12/2019	Staff	Bylaw Team Lead

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: If this individual is a booster, the 4-part test in the 6/6/2000 interpretation doesn't really apply, but the analysis under the extra benefit legislation would be similar. Either way, if the pattern of benefits was the same or similar prior to the friend's son becoming a PSA and enrolling at the institution, it would not be an extra benefit to continue to provide the suite access to the SA's family members. Because the staff member at IMG was friend's with SA's parent/s before the SA was born, and the benefit has not changed as SA became involved in athletics, there is not an extra benefit issue. If the individual in question is determined not to be a booster in this scenario, the benefit provided appears to satisfy the 4-part test in the 6/6/2000 interpretation, and does not constitute preferential treatment.

Case Summary

Specific Case Information

Describe the interpretive request.

IMG staff member has a long time friend since they were twelve years old. The staff member has been providing suite access at institutional football contests to the friend, his wife, and his son since his son was 9 years old and through high school. The son enrolled at our institution in Fall 2017 and has since been a member of the football program. The staff member has continued to provide suite access to the parents of the SA while he is a SA for them to watch the institution's football contests. The student-athlete was not on athletics financial aid during the 2017-18 academic year, but was put on athletics aid for the current 2018-19 academic year. The SA is a recruited SA, and his recruitment was triggered on January 20, 2017 with an official visit. SA also had in-person off-campus contact with a coaching staff member and one phone call.

Provide the conference analysis of the interpretive request.

Conference did not love the scenario, but said it was too close to call to make the distinction if this is a violation and that institution should submit an interpretive request.

Provide the institution's analysis of the interpretive request.

Institution has always been under the impression that the established relationships legislation applies to preferential treatment (Bylaw 12) and benefits legislation (Bylaw 16) and not recruiting legislation (Bylaw 13), based on the Bylaws cited in the June 6, 2000 interpretation. Institution feels that providing access to a suite for the SA when he was a PSA (including a recruited PSA) and to his parents when the SA was enrolled could be a violation due to recruiting and extra benefits legislation, however, the staff member did have an established relationship with the family and the PSA/SA that meets the criteria in the June 6, 2000 interpretation, in addition to having provided the same pattern of benefits (suite access) to the parents and the PSA/SA (use of an institutional suite to watch institutional football contests) that meets the June 6, 2000 interpretation. Institution would like an interpretive evaluation to see if a violation has occurred.



Institution: University of Connecticut
Case Type: Interpretation Request

Division: I

Case ID: 1051088
Date: 06/20/2019

[Decision PDF](#)

Decision

Your feedback is important. Would you like to give praise, report a problem or share an idea? With your help and input, we can continue to improve AMA's service and the RSRO submission process.

[Provide Feedback](#)

Status

Resolved

**Status
Date**

03/12/2019

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: If this individual is a booster, the 4-part test in the 6/6/2000 interpretation doesn't really apply, but the analysis under the extra benefit legislation would be similar. Either way, if the pattern of benefits was the same or similar prior to the friend's son becoming a PSA and enrolling at the institution, it would not be an extra benefit to continue to provide the suite access to the SA's family members. Because the staff member at IMG was friend's with SA's parent/s before the SA was born, and the benefit has not changed as SA became involved in athletics, there is not an extra benefit issue. If the individual in question is determined not to be a booster in this scenario, the benefit provided appears to satisfy the 4-part test in the 6/6/2000 interpretation, and does not constitute preferential treatment.

If you accept this decision, click "I Accept" below. Once you accept the decision the case will be closed. Do not click "I Accept" if your institution intends to appeal the decision. An appeal must be submitted within 30 days of the decision issued date and shall be submitted via the case "Withdraw/Appeal/Reconsideration" tab.



Case Summary

General Case Information

Case Number	Case Type	Sub Case Type	Release to Database
1054030	Interpretation Request	Recruiting - Bylaw 13	No

Division	Sport(s)
I	

Legislative Cite(s)

- Coach Writing Recommendation Letter for Prospect

Status Information

Status	Status Date	Status Level	Status Level Type
Resolved	04/10/2019	Staff	Director and Above

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: The conference and institutional analyses are correct. It is appropriate to use interpretive philosophy in this specific case to allow the institution's women's basketball coach to write a letter of recommendation for the daughter, who is a PSA, of the institution's director of women's basketball operations. Specifically, staff noted the long-standing relationship between the coach and the PSA's mother and noted the PSA is not an athletics award winner. Please note, the institution should feel comfortable that the impetus for writing the letter of recommendation is not tied to athletics recruitment.

Case Summary

Specific Case Information

Describe the interpretive request

Head women's basketball coach, Geno Auriemma, would like to write a letter of recommendation for the daughter of his director of basketball operations. The director of operations (Sarah Darras) has worked for Geno Auriemma for 25 years. The daughter is not a student-athlete and the letter of recommendation does not pose any recruiting advantage. Due to their longstanding relationship and the fact that the PSA is not a student-athlete we are requesting relief from this interpretation.

Provide the conference analysis of the interpretive request.

The American Athletic conference felt that due to the high profile of the head coach that it would be best interpreted by the NCAA. The conference analysis was that the letter of recommendation would be permissible given the circumstances.

Provide the institution's analysis of the interpretive request.

The letter of recommendation is a personal statement regarding Geno Auriemma's understanding of the director of operations daughter. He has been around her for her entire life and can speak to her character. There is no recruiting advantage and the circumstances are unique because it is rare that a director of operations and a head coach have worked together for 25 years or more.



Institution: University of Connecticut
Case Type: Interpretation Request

Division: I

Case ID: 1054030
Date: 06/20/2019

[Decision PDF](#)

Decision

Accepted Date 04/10/2019

Accepted By Kristen Hargis

Your feedback is important. Would you like to give praise, report a problem or share an idea? With your help and input, we can continue to improve AMA's service and the RSRO submission process.

[Provide Feedback](#)

Status

Resolved

**Status
Date**

04/10/2019

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: The conference and institutional analyses are correct. It is appropriate to use interpretive philosophy in this specific case to allow the institution's women's basketball coach to write a letter of recommendation for the daughter, who is a PSA, of the institution's director of women's basketball operations. Specifically, staff noted the long-standing relationship between the coach and the PSA's mother and noted the PSA is not an athletics award winner. Please note, the institution should feel comfortable that the impetus for writing the letter of recommendation is not tied to athletics recruitment.



Case Summary

General Case Information

Case Number	Case Type	Sub Case Type	Release to Database
1055594	Interpretation Request	Eligibility - Bylaw 14 Two-Year College Transfers-Bylaw 14.5.4 (Includes 4-2-4 Transfers-Bylaw 14.5.6)	No

Division **Sport(s)**

I

Legislative Cite(s)

- Student-athlete enrolling full time concurrently at a two-year and four-year institution
14.5.6 - 4-2-4 College Transfers.

Status Information

Status	Status Date	Status Level	Status Level Type
Resolved	05/02/2019	Staff	Bylaw Team Lead

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: Based on the facts provided, the SA in question should be considered a 4-2-4 transfer and must meet those 4-2-4 requirements to be eligible for competition. Due to the concurrent enrollment at both 4 year and two-year institutions, the SA's calendar year since departure from the first four-year institution does not begin until he completed formal action with the appropriate institutional authorities required for all students to indicate that he is leaving the previous four-year institution and no longer will be attending classes. This calendar year expiration date will not allow the student-athlete to be immediately eligible at a four-year institution. An approved two-year college transfer waiver would be necessary for immediate eligibility in the 2020 spring term.

Case Summary

Specific Case Information

Describe the interpretive request

Due to the nature of quarter schools a potential baseball transfer student-athlete began competing and attending classes at a 2-year institution concurrently to enrollment at a 4-year institution. He had previously competed for the 4-year institution (spring 2018). The potential student-athlete is enrolled full-time and competing at a 2-year institution. He attended school full-time at a neighboring 4-year institution for Fall and Winter trimesters and withdrew from the Spring trimester before attending classes. The staff interpretation from May 13, 1992 indicates that a 4-year and 2-year concurrent enrollment student where the student has competed for both the 4- and 2-year schools must adhere to both the 2-4 and 4-4 transfer rules. However, given the student has not participated at the 4-year institution in an academic year, can the student be assessed as a 2-year transfer only, instead of a 4-4? Given the year in residence requirement for the sport of baseball as a 4-4 transfer this interpretation seems unfairly harsh for those student-athletes that did not have an opportunity to compete at the 4-year institution and subsequently have not competed in over a year at that level.

Provide the conference analysis of the interpretive request.

The AAC thought that it would be best to submit an interpretive request as this is a quarter school but initially assessed that the student would have to meet both 2-4 and 4-4 requirements.

Provide the institution's analysis of the interpretive request.

If the student had been enrolled in a semester school concurrently at both a 2-year and a 4-year institution then this interpretation would be applied appropriately. However, given the fact that the 2-year baseball season began during the middle of the winter quarter the student could not withdraw, he had to wait until the end of the quarter before withdrawing, causing concurrent enrollment. However, had he remained at the 4-year institution (even though he previously competed) he would not have had an opportunity to compete and would not have been apart of the roster.



Institution: University of Connecticut
Case Type: Interpretation Request

Division: I

Case ID: 1055594
Date: 06/20/2019

[Decision PDF](#)

Decision

Accepted Date 05/03/2019

Accepted By Kristen Hargis

Your feedback is important. Would you like to give praise, report a problem or share an idea? With your help and input, we can continue to improve AMA's service and the RSRO submission process.

[Provide Feedback](#)

Status

Resolved

**Status
Date**

05/02/2019

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: Based on the facts provided, the SA in question should be considered a 4-2-4 transfer and must meet those 4-2-4 requirements to be eligible for competition. Due to the concurrent enrollment at both 4 year and two-year institutions, the SA's calendar year since departure from the first four-year institution does not begin until he completed formal action with the appropriate institutional authorities required for all students to indicate that he is leaving the previous four-year institution and no longer will be attending classes. This calendar year expiration date will not allow the student-athlete to be immediately eligible at a four-year institution. An approved two-year college transfer waiver would be necessary for immediate eligibility in the 2020 spring term.



Case Summary

General Case Information

Case Number	Case Type	Sub Case Type	Release to Database
1056257	Interpretation Request	Recruiting - Bylaw 13	No

Division	Sport(s)
I	

Legislative Cite(s)

13.12.1.4 - Additional Restrictions -- Basketball.
- Men's Basketball -- Camp Employment and Camp Logistics Issues (I)
13.12.1.7.1 - General Rule.

Status Information

Status	Status Date	Status Level	Status Level Type
Resolved	05/06/2019	Staff	Bylaw Team Meeting

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: Yes, it would be permissible to provide a "first come first serve discount, need based discount" to psas enrolling for a basketball camp provided that same discount is provided all other men's basketball camps. Please see question no. 2 of the June 14, 2012 educational column. If the camp is only for non-psas, the restrictions of bylaw 13.12.1.4 would not apply, even in the sport of men's basketball

Case Summary

Specific Case Information

Describe the interpretive request

Men's basketball is running two camps over the summer (the only two camps they are running) which both will include individuals from 4th grade through 12th grade (both camps will include PSAs and non-PSAs). Men's Basketball would like to provide a scholarship discount to only those in 4th-6th grade (non-PSA aged individuals) on a first come first serve basis and based on need. Is this a permissible discount to provide based on NCAA Bylaw 13.12.1.4 in that all mens/boys basketball camps have to have a similar fee structure, discount rates, registration, etc.

Provide the conference analysis of the interpretive request.

AAC is out of the office and recommended institution reach out to AMA via RSRO.

Provide the institution's analysis of the interpretive request.

Institution initially believed this would not be permissible since this is a camp that involves PSAs and non-PSAs and thus must be treated as a PSA camp per Bylaw 13.12. In addition, institution feels this would not meet Bylaw 13.12.1.4 in that the same discount is not available to all PSA and non-PSA aged campers. Finally, institution feels this could be a 13.02.13 issue in that not every non-PSA is eligible to receive the discount as discounts are on a first come first serve basis. That said, institution does believe there is flexibility in the fact that the discount is only being provided to non-PSAs and is not against the intent of Bylaw 13.12.1.4 (i.e., providing a better discount for a PSA aged camp than a non-PSA aged camp).



Institution: University of Connecticut
Case Type: Interpretation Request

Division: I

Case ID: 1056257
Date: 06/20/2019

[Decision PDF](#)

Decision

Accepted Date 05/06/2019

Accepted By Eric Schneider

Your feedback is important. Would you like to give praise, report a problem or share an idea? With your help and input, we can continue to improve AMA's service and the RSRO submission process.

[Provide Feedback](#)

Status

Resolved

**Status
Date**

05/06/2019

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: Yes, it would be permissible to provide a "first come first serve discount, need based discount" to psas enrolling for a basketball camp provided that same discount is provided all other men's basketball camps. Please see question no. 2 of the June 14, 2012 educational column. If the camp is only for non-psas, the restrictions of bylaw 13.12.1.4 would not apply, even in the sport of men's basketball



Case Summary

General Case Information

Case Number	Case Type	Sub Case Type	Release to Database
1057070	Interpretation Request	Recruiting - Bylaw 13	No

Division	Sport(s)
I	

Legislative Cite(s)

- Undergraduate Student Assistant Coach or Manager Serving During Required Summer Athletic Activities (I)
- Undergraduate Student Assistant Coach, Manager or Football Graduate Assistant Serving During Required Summer Athletic Activities (I)
- 13.12.2.3.3 - Institutional or Noninstitutional, Privately Owned Camps/Clinics -- Basketball.

Status Information

Status	Status Date	Status Level	Status Level Type
Resolved	05/10/2019	Staff	Individual

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: Yes, an undergraduate manager who will graduate at the end of the spring term (and who may not return to the institution for fall 2019) can work at the NCAA College Basketball Academy. Specifically, it is permissible to work the camp as either an undergraduate manager (who may permissibly continue managerial duties during the summer) or an outside individual hired through the normal employment process.

Case Summary

Specific Case Information

Describe the interpretive request

Institution is hosting one of the regional NCAA Youth Basketball Camps in July 2019. AMA has confirmed with institution that Men's Basketball managers are permitted to work the camp as score keepers and timers ONLY. Institution has a current undergraduate manager who is graduating with his bachelors degree in May 2019. Institution is unsure yet if the manager will be returning for the 2019-20 academic year as a graduate manager. Is the current undergraduate manager permitted to work the camp during the upcoming summer even though he will have graduated already with his undergraduate degree? Institution feels that it would be permissible for the undergraduate manager to continue to work the NCAA Youth Basketball Camp this coming summer as based on the 6/7/13 attached interpretation, he would be able to work in summer athletic activities even though he has graduated since he was enrolled full-time in the preceding regular academic term (i.e., Spring 2019).

Provide the conference analysis of the interpretive request.

Provide the institution's analysis of the interpretive request.



Institution: University of Connecticut
Case Type: Interpretation Request

Division: I

Case ID: 1057070
Date: 06/20/2019

[Decision PDF](#)

Decision

Your feedback is important. Would you like to give praise, report a problem or share an idea? With your help and input, we can continue to improve AMA's service and the RSRO submission process.

[Provide Feedback](#)

Status

Resolved

**Status
Date**

05/10/2019

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: Yes, an undergraduate manager who will graduate at the end of the spring term (and who may not return to the institution for fall 2019) can work at the NCAA College Basketball Academy. Specifically, it is permissible to work the camp as either an undergraduate manager (who may permissibly continue managerial duties during the summer) or an outside individual hired through the normal employment process.

If you accept this decision, click "I Accept" below. Once you accept the decision the case will be closed. Do not click "I Accept" if your institution intends to appeal the decision. An appeal must be submitted within 30 days of the decision issued date and shall be submitted via the case "Withdraw/Appeal/Reconsideration" tab.



Case Summary

General Case Information

Case Number	Case Type	Sub Case Type	Release to Database
1060268	Interpretation Request	Recruiting - Bylaw 13	No

Division	Sport(s)
I	

Legislative Cite(s)

13.14.1 - Institutional Control.
- Coaching Staff Members Expending Personal Funds and Seeking Reimbursement for Recruiting Expenses (I/II/III)

Status Information

Status	Status Date	Status Level	Status Level Type
Resolved	06/11/2019	Staff	Bylaw Team Meeting

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: While actual reimbursement is not permissible per the policies of your state/institution, the primary concern of the legislation is to ensure the institution remains aware and in control of all funds used for the purposes of athletic recruitment.

Therefore, the following components should be included in your policy to meet the intent of the legislation:

1. Pre-approval for the coach to expend specific recruiting funds; and
2. Post-expense documentation (even if no reimbursement occurs) of expenses as a "donation-in-kind".
 - a.It would be permissible to develop a donation process specific to these type of expenses.

Case Summary

Specific Case Information

Describe the interpretive request

In a joint interpretive request between the institution and AMA during a recent major infractions case (interpretation attached), it was stated that it is a violation if coaches do not seek reimbursement for recruiting expenses they paid for on their own on the front end and if this is not approved and consistent with institutional policies then it is a violation. Through this, it has since been clarified by the Athletics Business Office that institutional and IRS policy for all institutional employees is that mileage reimbursements will not be provided to staff members should their mileage for a work related function be less than the mileage for their daily commute to work. Further, institutional policy states that staff will not be reimbursed for the cost of lodging within the state of Connecticut (where institution is located). If coaches do not get reimbursed out of their institutional recruiting budget for mileage and/or lodging, does this constitute a violation of Bylaw 13.14.1, or since this is following institutional policy, would this be permissible. Institution feels this is permissible since the recruiting trips are being approved per athletics department policies and the reimbursements are being treated the same for all employees under institutional and IRS policies. Thus, this would meet the 8/22/07 staff interpretation.

Provide the conference analysis of the interpretive request.

Provide the institution's analysis of the interpretive request.



Institution: University of Connecticut
Case Type: Interpretation Request

Division: I

Case ID: 1060268
Date: 06/20/2019

[Decision PDF](#)

Decision

Your feedback is important. Would you like to give praise, report a problem or share an idea? With your help and input, we can continue to improve AMA's service and the RSRO submission process.

[Provide Feedback](#)

Status

Resolved

Status Date

06/11/2019

Conditions

Rationale

Interpretation:: While actual reimbursement is not permissible per the policies of your state/institution, the primary concern of the legislation is to ensure the institution remains aware and in control of all funds used for the purposes of athletic recruitment.

Therefore, the following components should be included in your policy to meet the intent of the legislation:

1. Pre-approval for the coach to expend specific recruiting funds; and
2. Post-expense documentation (even if no reimbursement occurs) of expenses as a "donation-in-kind".
 - a. It would be permissible to develop a donation process specific to these type of expenses.

If you accept this decision, click "I Accept" below. Once you accept the decision the case will be closed. Do not click "I Accept" if your institution intends to appeal the decision. An appeal must be submitted within 30 days of the decision issued date and shall be submitted via the case "Withdraw/Appeal/Reconsideration" tab.